

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 3, 34, 35, and 37 have been canceled. Claims 1-2, 4-33, and 36 are pending, of which claims 1, 2, 5, 10-12, 15, 21-25, 27, 29, and  
5 36 have been amended.

**35 U.S.C. §102 Claim Rejections**

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 10-11, 22-28, 30-31, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,097,497 to  
10 McGraw et al. (hereinafter, "McGraw") (*Office Action* p.2, ¶2). Claim 37 is canceled. Applicant respectfully traverses the other claim rejections.

Claim 1 recites a printing device comprising "a memory component integrated with a replaceable component of the printing device". Claim 1 is  
15 amended to include feature(s) of claim 3 which is now canceled, and the Office recognizes that McGraw fails to teach a memory component integrated with a replaceable component of the printing device (*Office Action* p.10, ¶23).

Accordingly, claim 1, as well as dependent claims 2, 4-7, and 10-11, are allowable over McGraw and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102  
20 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 22 recites a method comprising "maintaining information ... with a memory component that is integrated with a replaceable component of the printing device". As described above in the response to the rejection of claim  
25 1, the Office recognizes that McGraw fails to teach a memory component integrated with a replaceable component of a printing device (*Office Action* p.10, ¶23).

Accordingly, claim 22, as well as dependent claims 23-28 and 30-31, are allowable over McGraw and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

5           **35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections**

**1<sup>st</sup> §103 rejection**   Claims 8 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over McGraw (*Office Action* p.9, ¶20). Claims 8 and 32 are allowable, however, by virtue of their dependency upon claims 1 and 22, respectively, which are each allowable for the reasons provided herein.

10           **2<sup>nd</sup> §103 rejection**   Claims 3 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over McGraw in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,375,298 to Purcell et al. (hereinafter, "Purcell") (*Office Action* p.9, ¶22). Claim 1 is amended to include feature(s) of claim 3 which is now canceled, and claim 22 is amended to include feature(s) of claim 34 which is now canceled. Applicant  
15           respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites "a memory component integrated with a replaceable component of the printing device, the memory component configured to maintain information about the print media which can be obtained for  
20           marketing analysis." The Office recognizes that McGraw fails to teach a memory component integrated with a replaceable component of a printing device (*Office Action* p.10, ¶23).

          Purcell describes a memory element that is an integrated circuit memory on an inkjet cartridge which interfaces with printer electronics for printer  
25           operation and optimization (*Purcell* col.2, lines 51-54; col.1, lines 66-67). McGraw and/or Purcell, however, do not teach or suggest "the memory

component configured to maintain information about the print media which can be obtained for marketing analysis", as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly claim 1 is allowable over the McGraw-Purcell combination and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

5

Claim 22 recites "maintaining information for marketing analysis, the information maintained with a memory component that is integrated with a replaceable component of the printing device, and the information corresponding to a total number of print media routed in the printing device and a total number of a particular type of print media having a determinable media identifier."

10

As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, McGraw and/or Purcell do not teach or suggest "maintaining information for marketing analysis, the information maintained with a memory component that is integrated with a replaceable component of the printing device" and the information corresponding to the print media, as recited in claim 22.

15

Accordingly claim 22 is allowable over the McGraw-Purcell combination and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

20

3<sup>rd</sup> §103 rejection Claims 12-14, 16-19, 21, 29, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over McGraw in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,577,907 to Czyszczewski et al. (hereinafter, "Czyszczewski") (*Office Action* p.10, ¶24). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

25

Claim 12 recites a system comprising "a plurality of printing devices" and "an information database configured to maintain information from the plurality of printing devices, the information corresponding to" print media. The Office recognizes that McGraw fails to teach a printer being one of a plurality of printers and an information database configured to maintain information from the plurality of printing devices (*Office Action* p.11, ¶25).

Czyszczewski describes a system in which a document can be retrieved from one of a global or local service, and the document can be routed to a destination such as a local or global printer (*Czyszczewski* col.7, lines 14-22). Czyszczewski does not, however, teach or suggest "an information database configured to maintain information *from* the plurality of printing devices", as recited in claim 12. The Office contends that Czyszczewski teaches such a database at col.9, lines 31-54 (*Office Action* p.11, ¶25). Applicant disagrees because Czyszczewski only describes database information such as documents and forms that can be retrieved, user identification and other security information, and user directory information (*Czyszczewski* col.9, lines 31-54). Czyszczewski says nothing about information *from* printing devices.

Accordingly claim 12, as well as dependent claims 13-14, 16-19, and 21, are allowable over the McGraw-Purcell combination and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 29 and 35 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 22 which is allowable for the reasons provided herein.

4<sup>th</sup> §103 rejection Claims 9 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over McGraw in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,925,889 to Guillory et al. (hereinafter, "Guillory") (*Office Action* p.14, ¶34). Claims 9 and 33 are allowable, however, by virtue of their dependency upon claims 1 and 22, respectively, which are each allowable for the reasons provided herein.

5  
5<sup>th</sup> §103 rejection Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over McGraw in view of Czyszczewski and further in view of Purcell (*Office Action* p.15, ¶36). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

10

Claim 15 recites "a memory component integrated with a replaceable component of the individual printing device, the memory component configured to maintain the information for the individual printing device which can be obtained for marketing analysis." The Office recognizes that both McGraw and Czyszczewski fail to disclose a memory component being integrated with a replaceable component of a printing device (*Office Action* p.16, ¶37).

As described above in the response to the §103 rejection of claim 1, Purcell only describes a memory element that is an integrated circuit memory on an inkjet cartridge which interfaces with printer electronics for printer operation and optimization (*Purcell* col.2, lines 51-54; col.1, lines 66-67). Purcell does not teach or suggest "the memory component configured to maintain the information for the individual printing device which can be obtained for marketing analysis", as recited in claim 15.

25 Accordingly claim 15 is allowable over the McGraw-Czyszczewski-Purcell combination and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

**6<sup>th</sup> 103 rejection** Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over McGraw in view of Czyszczewski and further in view of Guillory (*Office Action* p.16, ¶38). Claim 20, however, is allowable by virtue of its dependency upon claim 12 which is allowable for the reasons provided herein.

**Conclusion**

Pending claims 1-2, 4-33, and 36 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: Oct 8, 2003

By: 

David A. Morasch  
Reg. No. 42,905  
(509) 324-9256 x 210

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
OCT 09 2003

OFFICIAL